

COMMITTEE TO ADVISE ON PERFORMANCE FUNDING AND ASSESSMENT (CAPA)
Advisory Committee to Planning, Assessment And Performance Funding Committee

Minutes of July 8, 2002

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Large Conference Room

Members Present

Dr. David Hunter (USC, Regional Campuses)
Dr. Robert Isenhower (Spartanburg Tech)
Ms. Karen C. Jones (Winthrop)
Ms. Dorcas Kitchings (Midlands Tech)
Dr. Harry Matthews (USC Columbia)
Ms. Chris Mee (Coastal Carolina)
Mr. Bob Mellon (S.B.T.C.E)
Dr. Isaac "Spike" Metts (Citadel)
Dr. Jacqueline Skubal (Denmark Tech)
Ms. Michelle Smith (College of Charleston)
Dr. Rita Teal (SC State)
Mr. Jonathan Trail (USC Spartanburg)

CHE Staff Present

Ms. Camille Brown
Ms. Saundra Carr
Dr. David Loope
Dr. Michael Raley
Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong
Ms. Julie Wahl

Guests Present

Ms. Mary-David Fox (USC Beaufort)
Dr. Mary Gunn (Coastal Carolina)
Ms. Jodie Herrin (USC Aiken)
Ms. Star Kepner (USC-Sumter)
Mr. Mac Kirkpatrick (Lander)
Dr. Carol Lancaster (MUSC)
Mr. Russell Long (USC Columbia)
Ms. Shelly Long (Coastal Carolina)
Dr. Charles Parker (Midlands Tech)
Ms. Rose Pellatt (Spartanburg Tech)
Ms. Anna T. Strange (Central Carolina Tech)
Ms. Catherine Watt (Clemson)

Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong opened the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

I. Review and acceptance of minutes from June 14, 2002

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong noted corrections that had been made to the minutes prior to the meeting. Dr. Harry Matthews requested that currently be inserted on page 4 of the minutes as drafted (page 5 of the materials mailed to members), 3rd paragraph, and last sentence. The phrase should read, "...pointing out that since there is a disagreement as what the indicator currently measures..." (Attachment 1) It was the consensus of the group to accept the minutes with the noted changes.

II. Continuation from June 14, 2002, of Discussion of Performance Funding Indicator 2A

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong opened the floor for discussion. Dr. Harry Matthews, USC Columbia, referred the audience to the mail out dated July 2 to CAPA members and other interested parties. Dr. Matthews referenced a letter with an attachment to Dr. Ulmer-Sottong from him (Attachment 2a). He briefly explained the contents of the letter and the procedural issue needing clarification as to whether instructors were never to be included as interpreted by the research sector or instructors were to be included as interpreted by staff. He explained that the research sector appealed the indicator and the appeal was referred to this group.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong explained the issues that the staff has with this appeal. She discussed an email dated April 29 from Mike Smith concerning this issue and a letter to Dr. Jerome Odom, USC Columbia, from Dr. Rayburn Barton, CHE Executive Director. She also noted that she contacted all teaching sector representatives and all indicated that it was clear that instructors were to be included in the calculation of this indicator. She discussed the scoring of this indicator last year and how the data were calculated.

Ms. Wahl explained the historical chart (Attachment 2b) that was distributed at the meeting. A transcript (Attachment 3) of an ACIR meeting dated on July 12th was distributed. At this meeting, representatives discussed 2A and the issue of whether or not instructors were included. It was indicated at that time that instructors were only to be removed from the 2D Indicator and not the 2A Indicator.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated that the tape of the ACIR meeting was available to the group. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated that she felt all along that this indicator clearly has been a misunderstanding between staff and some institutional representatives. She also said that this indicator along with several other “academic” indicators would go before the Academic Affairs Committee for next year. She suggested that we keep instructors in the indicator for one year only and ask the Provosts at the institutions to look at this indicator to determine if it could be better defined. She said that several Provosts had indicated to her that they wanted to be more involved with defining academic indicators. There were several comments from institutional representatives.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong asked the group to consider making this indicator a compliance indicator for this year. Institutional representatives felt that they needed “scored” indicators particularly since the scored indicators were reduced from 37.

It was moved (Metts) seconded (Watts) to recommend for the coming year instructors should be left out for 2A and 2D for this year. The floor was opened for discussion. After several comments Dr. Ulmer-Sottong requested a 15-minute break.

After returning, Dr. Ulmer-Sottong asked if the research institutions would agree that the confusion around this indicator had been a “true misunderstanding” and not intentional on the part of CHE staff. Dr. Matthews agreed.. After further discussion, Dr. Metts withdrew his motion.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong then suggested that data be turned in as it is done for 2A and 2D for all faculty and the Commission would not use instructors in the scoring for 2A for this year only. Staff will use only professor, associate professor, and assistant professor for 2A only until this indicator is redefined. It was the consensus of the group to accept Dr. Ulmer-Sottong’s suggestion. Dr. Matthews requested that data for the instructors for 2D not be shown with performance funding. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong agreed to do this.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong explained that she would briefly discuss Indicators 2A, 3D, and 7D indicators at the Advisory Committee for Academic Affairs on July 25. She explained her rationale for this action. Since Agenda Items V and VI were discussed in length with Agenda Item II, it was the consensus of the group to move on to Agenda Item 3 and that there would be no need for further discussion of V and VI.

III. Legislative Changes affecting Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Reporting

Dr. Michael Raley discussed changes to SC Code 59-101-350 (Attachment III) as amended in 2001 to add reporting requirements related to teacher education and economic development. He solicited advice from the group concerning Title II reporting on web pages of institutions. CAPA members responded that Title II information appeared on their institutional WEB pages. He requested links be submitted to him to meet the reporting requirements. Dr. Raley read the second part of the change to the group. He explained that a statement has been in the report addressing this issue in the past; however, he interprets the requirement as needing to be included in the IE Report for each institution. Dr. Raley asked institutions to provide suggestions for wording and the approach for handling this request. Ms. Catherine Watt volunteered to set up a list serve for CAPA.

VIII. Other Business

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong discussed a retreat for this group. She suggested a meeting and a social dinner in September or October. The purpose is to allow people to get to know one another in a social setting. No dates were set at this meeting. It was suggested that after September 15 or toward the end of the month would be better for institutions considering Fall Semester will be starting in September. Dr. Ulmer-Sottong agreed to look at a Thursday/Friday for this activity. Dates will be sent out to the group in order to find the most convenient dates for the group.

IV. Regulatory Relief (IE Issues)

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong gave a brief background review of the Regulatory Relief Report. She then asked, "What issues in the report do we want to discuss and open up for next year?" Dr. Ulmer-Sottong stated that any revisions to the law would have to be submitted for legislative action for next year. She cautioned that once one accountability law is open, there is a risk of opening more than the one item of interest. In response to statements that no one ever looks at these reports, she stated that she has talked to several legislative aides and they appear to know the law and the reports that we generate.

Dr. Ulmer-Sottong asked "How would you like to proceed on indicators that are sector specific? For example, she identified indicator 4A for each of the sectors. The group agreed that those issues should be handled, at least mutually, in sector meetings.

9B for Research and 2D and 5A for all sectors are under review. CHE staff will prepare draft recommendations that will be sent out for suggestions because these issues need to be settled for Year 7 of Performance Funding.

Respectfully submitted,

Saundra E. Carr
Recording Secretary